

**Submission on the VAFFC Jet Fuel Transport Issue from John Roston,  
12262 Ewen Ave., to Richmond City Council, January 23, 2012.**

1. The EAO process will just say yes or no to the VAFFC preferred option of tankers on the Fraser. It will not decide that another particular option is superior. While an excellent job has been done of filing objections to tankers on the Fraser, there is a danger that it will be approved on the basis of being better than the other available options. The best outcome from the EAO process would be a rejection of the VAFFC proposal (Option 1) on the basis that other options deserve much more thorough investigation than has been done to date. Achieving this outcome requires making it a political decision as much as an EAO one. The City's commendable participation in the EAO process must be accompanied by a publicity campaign aimed at the BC Premier and the BC Minister of the Environment. If the City isn't able to get the Vancouver newspapers to do major articles on the issue then full page ads may be required.
2. The publicity campaign must make the case that at least one other option has the potential to be superior. It also has to be shown that there is time for a proper investigation of other options, contrary to the VAFFC assertion that time is very short and there will be a critical shortage of jet fuel in 2013.
3. The future rate of increase in the demand for jet fuel is a matter of speculation and will almost certainly be less than the rate shown on the VAFFC chart [figure 2.3.2] "Historic and Forecast Daily Peak Fuel Consumption at YVR." It shows a historic high in 2000 and lower consumption in the following years 2001-2009 with the demand both rising and falling from year to year and then suddenly only rising steadily as it heads into the future. This is based on a YVR chart [figure 2.3.3] showing future passenger projections with a similar straight line rising steadily into the future. In fact, passenger levels have historically shown a rising and falling pattern with 16.8 million passengers in 2010 [YVR 2010 Annual Report], down from a peak of 17.9 million in 2008, despite the Olympics. It's unlikely that even a steady 2% annual increase in passengers would result in much more fuel being required in 2013 than was required in 2008. Occasional peak demand can be met with additional fuel trucks from Cherry Point.
4. The point has to be made forcefully that Option 3 (upgraded Trans Mountain pipeline from Burnaby), and perhaps Option 8 (pipeline from Cherry Point), deserve much more thorough investigation than has been done to date. The U.S. Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration in its *Report on the State of the National Pipeline Infrastructure* states, "It is far safer to ship these products [gas and hazardous liquids] through a pipeline than it is to ship it by truck, train, boat, or any other mode of transportation." [p.4]
5. Most major North American airports have their jet fuel delivered by pipeline. This includes those like YVR located close to an ocean where there are similar options for transporting jet fuel by land or by sea – e.g. New York's JFK and Seattle's Sea-Tac. JFK's jet fuel is delivered through a 64 km pipeline from Linden, New Jersey, that passes through the New York boroughs of Staten Island, Brooklyn and Queens. Sea-Tac's jet fuel is delivered through an approximately 160 km pipeline (the Olympic Pipeline) from the same BP Cherry Point refinery that provides jet fuel for YVR. The Olympic Pipeline is 65% owned by the Canadian company Enbridge.
6. While the various VAFFC documents and studies refer to many expert consultants, the list doesn't appear to include anyone from Trans Mountain or Enbridge, the companies with the most experience shipping jet fuel in our region.